

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the instant response. Claims 1-27 are rejected. The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1, 4, 5, 10-12, 15, 16, 18-20, 23, 24, 26 and 27. Claims 2, 3, 6-9, 13, 14, 17, 21, 22 and 25 are cancelled herein without prejudice. Claims 1, 4, 12, 15, 18, 20, 23 and 26 are amended herein. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments. Support for the claim amendments can be found at least in cancelled Claims 2, 3, 6-9, 13, 14, 17, 21, 22 and 25, and page 9, lines 8-9, page 18, lines 1-19, page 21, lines 1-9 and Figure 4 of Applicant's specification.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12, 13, 15-21 and 23-27

The Office Action mailed on March 3, 2011 (hereinafter, "instant Office Action") rejects Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-10, 12, 13, 15-21 and 23-27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Butman et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 6,026,430) (hereinafter, "Butman"). Applicants respectfully submit that since Claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, 17, 21 and 25 are cancelled herein without prejudice, the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections of Claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, 17, 21 and 25 are moot. However, since features of cancelled Claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, 17, 21 and 25 are included in amended Claims 1, 12 and 20, the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejections of Claims 2, 6, 8, 9, 13, 17, 21 and 25 will be addressed herein. The rejections and comments set forth in the instant Office Action have been carefully considered by the Applicants. Applicants

respectfully submit that Claims 1-5 are not anticipated by Richardson in view of at least the instant response.

Applicants respectfully point out that amended Claim 1 recites (Claims 12 and 20 include similar features):

An interactive grid computing system comprising:
a computing service provider side comprising:
an interactive grid computing service provider comprising:
a grid distributed resource management system (grid DRM)
configured for managing a plurality of execution nodes;
at least one resource that said grid DRM reserves for a client
based on a request from said client, through a submission node, for an
interactive session for a service that said resource is enabled to
provide, wherein said at least one resource comprises at least one
remote execution node of said plurality of remote execution nodes and
at least one fine grained resource, said at least one resource reserved
for a requested duration of said interactive session;
a first firewall coupled to said at least one resource and
configured for protecting said at least one resource, wherein said first
firewall is hosting a VNC proxy server;
a remote display server coupled to said first firewall for
providing, at a requested time, secure access, by said submission
node, to said at least one resource over a secure connection and for
providing interactive graphical data associated with said at least one
resource, wherein said client is enabled to communicate directly with
said at least one resource over said secure connection during said
interactive session;
a software agent associated with said at least one resource,
wherein if said at least one resource is requested by said client, said
software agent initiates interactive communication between said
remote display server and a remote display resource; and
a client side coupled to said interactive grid computing service provider, said
client side comprising:
a client comprising said remote display resource configured for
communicating with said remote display server through said secure
connection to access said interactive graphical data provided by said remote
display server, wherein said remote display resource is a virtual network
computing viewer modified for secure access and for viewing a graphical
desktop display associated with said at least one resource, wherein a
modification of said virtual network computing viewer comprises:

an established connection between said virtual network computing viewer and said VNC proxy server using a destination host and a destination port address;

a retrieved handle configured for facilitating a creation of a secure socket, said retrieved handle used to create said secure connection through a socks tunnel; and

a second firewall configured for protecting said client, said second firewall hosting a SOCKS proxy server, wherein said secure connection is through said socks tunnel and is used to tunnel said interactive graphical data through said second firewall.

(Emphasis added.)

MPEP §2131 provides:

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference”. MPEP §2131; *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 103 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ... “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). “The elements must be arranged as required by the claim...” *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants respectfully agree with the instant Office Action that states, “Butman does not explicitly teach that the remote display resource is a VNC” (instant Office Action, page 9, section 3), and “Butman does not explicitly teach that the proxy server is a VNC server” (instant Office Action, page 10, section 3), as is recited in Applicants’ amended Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Butman does not anticipate the features as are set forth in independent Claim 1, and as such, Claim 1 traverses the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and is condition for allowance. Furthermore,

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12 and 20 are in condition for allowance for the reasons stated herein with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants also respectfully submit that Claims 4, 5, 10 and 11 depending on Claim 1, Claims 15, 16, 18 and 19 depending on Claim 12, and Claims 23 and 26 depending on Claim 20 are in condition for allowance as being dependent upon an allowable base claim.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claim Rejections

Claims 3, 7, 11, 14 and 22

The instant Office Action rejects Claims 3, 7, 11, 14 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Butman in view of Herse et al. (U.S. patent Application No. 7,127,745) (hereinafter, “Herse”). Applicants respectfully note that Claims 3, 7, 11, 14 and 22 are cancelled herein, and thus the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of Claims 3, 7, 11, 14 and 22 are moot. However, since the features of Claims 3, 7, 11, 14 and 22 are added into Claims 1, 12 and 20, Applicants will address the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of Claims 3, 7, 11, 14 and 22. Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 1 are patentable over Butman in view of Herse for at least the following rationale.

“As reiterated by the Supreme Court in *KSR*, the framework for the objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 is stated in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966). Obviousness is a question of law based on underlying factual inquiries” including “[a]scertaining the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art” (MPEP 2141(II)). “In determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C.

103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious” (emphasis in original; MPEP 2141.02(I)). Applicants note that “[t]he prior art reference (or references when combined) need not teach or suggest all the claim limitations, however, Office personnel must explain why the difference(s) between the prior art and the claimed invention would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art” (emphasis added; MPEP 2141(III)).

Applicants respectfully submit that both Butman and Herse fail to teach and/or suggest, and in fact remain silent as to:

An interactive grid computing system comprising:
a computing service provider side comprising:
an interactive grid computing service provider comprising:
a grid distributed resource management system (grid DRM)
configured for managing a plurality of execution nodes;
at least one resource that said grid DRM reserves for a client based on a request from said client, through a submission node, for an interactive session for a service that said resource is enabled to provide, wherein said at least one resource comprises at least one remote execution node of said plurality of remote execution nodes and at least one fine grained resource, said at least one resource reserved for a requested duration of said interactive session;
a first firewall coupled to said at least one resource and configured for protecting said at least one resource, wherein said first firewall is hosting a VNC proxy server;
a remote display server coupled to said first firewall for providing, at a requested time, secure access, by said submission node, to said at least one resource over a secure connection and for providing interactive graphical data associated with said at least one resource, wherein said client is enabled to communicate directly with said at least one resource over said secure connection during said interactive session;
a software agent associated with said at least one resource, wherein if said at least one resource is requested by said client, said software agent initiates interactive communication between said remote display server and a remote display resource; and

a client side coupled to said interactive grid computing service provider, said client side comprising:

a client comprising said remote display resource configured for communicating with said remote display server through said secure connection to access said interactive graphical data provided by said remote display server, wherein said remote display resource is a virtual network computing viewer modified for secure access and for viewing a graphical desktop display associated with said at least one resource, wherein a modification of said virtual network computing viewer comprises:

an established connection between said virtual network computing viewer and said VNC proxy server using a destination host and a destination port address;

a retrieved handle configured for facilitating a creation of a secure socket, said retrieved handle used to create said secure connection through a socks tunnel; and

a second firewall configured for protecting said client, said second firewall hosting a SOCKS proxy server, wherein said secure connection is through said socks tunnel and is used to tunnel said interactive graphical data through said second firewall.

as recited in amended Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Applicants understand Butman to disclose a “dynamic client registry apparatus and method” (Butman, Title) in which a registry is used “to organize information from client entities on different networks for selective sharing” (Butman, Abstract). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Butman remains silent as to, “wherein said at least one resource comprises at least one remote execution node of said plurality of remote execution nodes and at least one fine grained resource” as is recited in Applicants’ Claim 1. While Applicants’ specification defines “fine grained resources” as, but not limited to, a central processing unit and network bandwidth, and the reservation thereof, Butman discusses “objects” (Butman, Column 21, lines 41-67) but remains silent as to the reservation of such resources such as the execution nodes and fine grained resources of Applicants’ Claim 1.

Applicants understand Herse to teach a “method of controlling access for software development via a virtual common desktop with plural viewers” (Herse, Title) wherein within “a virtual network computing (VNC) system wherein multiple users, or viewers, at different locations share a common desktop computer for the purpose of sharing control of software applications, the VNCSESSION owner exercises dynamic Internet protocol (IP)-based control over access of the viewers to the server associated with the shared desktop” (Herse, Abstract). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Herse also remains silent as to the reservation of such resources such as the execution nodes and fine grained resources of Applicants’ Claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that both Butman and Herse remain silent as to:

...wherein said remote display resource is a virtual network computing viewer modified for secure access and for viewing a graphical desktop display associated with said at least one resource, wherein a modification of said virtual network computing viewer comprises:

- an established connection between said virtual network computing viewer and said VNC proxy server using a destination host and a destination port address;
- a retrieved handle configured for facilitating a creation of a secure socket, said retrieved handle used to create said secure connection through a socks tunnel; and
- a second firewall configured for protecting said client, said second firewall hosting a SOCKS proxy server, wherein said secure connection is through said socks tunnel and is used to tunnel said interactive graphical data through said second firewall.

(emphasis added) as is recited in Applicants’ Claim 1. Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that both Butman and Herse necessarily remain silent as to, “a

software agent associated with said at least one resource, wherein if said at least one resource is requested by said client, said software agent initiates interactive communication between said remote display server and a remote display resource” since Butman and Herse remain silent as to the “at least one resource”, as explained herein.

Furthermore Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Herse provides the motivation to modify Butman to arrive at the features of Applicants’ Claim 1. Additionally, Applicants respectfully note that the instant Office action fails to explain why the differences between the features of Applicants’ amended Claim 1 and the features of the combination of Butman and Herse would have been obvious.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Butman and Herse, as a whole, does not satisfy a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that since the combination of Butman and Herse does not render obvious the claimed embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent Claim 1, Claim 1 overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and is in condition for allowance. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12 and 20 are in condition for allowance for the reasons stated herein with respect to Claim 1. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3, 7 and 11 depending on Claim 1, Claim 14 depending on Claim 12 and Claim 22 depending on Claim 20 are in condition for allowance as being depending on an allowable base claim. Furthermore,

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-5 depending on Claim 1 are in condition for allowance as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1, 4, 5, 10-12, 15, 16, 18-20, 23, 24, 26 and 27 overcome the rejections of record, and therefore Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER BLECHER LLP

Date: 06/03/2011

/John P. Wagner, Jr./
John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, CA 95076 USA
(408) 377-0500